

Le.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

81

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/207,945 12/09/98 NGUYEN

B 5577-115

EXAMINER

020792 TM02/0814
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH NC 27627

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176
DATE MAILED:

08/14/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Gay

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/207,945

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Thu v Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 03/04/1999; and application filed on 12/09/1998
2. Claims 1-57 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 13, 20, 28, 32, 39, 47, and 51 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1- 4, 6, 7, 9-17, 19-23, 25, 26, 28-36, 38-42, 44, 45, 47-55, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wodarz et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,999,912 (issued 12/ 1999) in view of Cuomo et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,185,614 B1 (issued 02/2001).**

Regarding independent claim 1, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

- generating the requested web page, wherein the generated web page includes a content object having a unique identifier associated therewith (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 12).

Art Unit: 2176

- serving the generated web page to the web client (Wodarz, col.3, line 39 – col.4, line 15).

However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the steps of storing a record of the user request within a web server log; appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page. Cuomo discloses the step of:

- storing a record of the user request within a web server log (Cuomo, col.1, lines 34-37).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Cuomo to help the server to provide web pages which based on the user specific characteristics as Wodarz disclosed at col.2, lines 7-13, since “storing a record of the user request within a web server log” would have easily helped the server keep track of the user’s information.

Wodarz and Cuomo do not explicitly disclose the step of appending the stored record of the user request with the unique identifier associated with the content object included within the generated web page. However, Wodarz discloses the step of the parser determines “ad ID code to force the association of a particular ad with the ad with the ad tag” (col.1, lines 60-62). Further, Wodarz discloses the step of selection of ads to provide to the user are based on user specific characteristic (col.2, lines 7-13) and “tracks the number of times an ad is viewed” (col.2, lines 16-17) which suggest the ad ID would be stored within the server to help the server keep track the behavior of the user. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have appreciated that the advertisement IDs are stored within the

Art Unit: 2176

server such as the user record in the sever log to help the server provide web pages to the user which are customized to user's needs, since the ad IDs are appended with the user's record, it would have helped the server efficiently track what the user's particular interest are to provide appropriate advertisements to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 1 as explained above. Cuomo discloses wherein the record of the request includes information that identifies the user (Cuomo, col.1, lines 32-37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Cuomo to help the server provide web pages which meet the user's interest, since basing on user identifier, the server would be able to serve web pages to appropriate user's needs.

Regarding dependent claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein the step of generating the requested web page comprises the steps of:

- retrieving a layout template for the requested web page, wherein the layout template defines how content objects are displayed within the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-40).
- retrieving the content object (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-62).
- combining the content object and the layout template to produce the requested web page (Wodarz, col.1, line 35 – col.2, line 6).

Regarding dependent claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 3 as explained above. Wodarz discloses the method according to claim 3 wherein the content object is selected from the group of image files, hyperlinks (col.3, lines 55-61). However, Wodarz does not explicitly disclose the content object is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included that advertisement object is selected from the group of text files, audio files, and video file, since it would have helped the generated web page more attractive to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz also discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of providing web page based on the “age, sex,, language”, which implies the step of analyzing a plurality of stored user request records to determine web content preferences of a user.

Regarding dependent claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 1 as explained above. Cuomo discloses the step of appending the stored record of the user request with a time stamp for a subsequence user request for a web page (col.1, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz and Cuomo to help the server more

Art Unit: 2176

accurately analyze the user's records to determine web content preferences of a user, since the more user's information a server captures, the better the quality of the statistics would have been.

Regarding independent claim 9, claim 9 includes limitations of claims 1 and 3, and is rejected under the same rationale of these claims. However, Claim 9 is different from claims 1 and 3 is the generated web page includes *first and second content objects having respective unique first and second identifiers* associated therewith. However, Wodarz also discloses the generated web page includes many advertisement objects having respective identifiers (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-52).

Regarding dependent claim 10, claim 10 includes limitation of claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 11, claim 11 includes limitation of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 12, claim 12 includes limitation of claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 13, Wodarz teaches the steps of:

Art Unit: 2176

- associating dynamically generated web page content with a user who requests a web page from a web server via a web client in communication with the web server (Wodarz, col.1, lines 35-52).

Regarding dependent claim 14, claim 14 includes limitation of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 15, claim 15 includes limitation of claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 16, claim 16 includes limitation of claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 17, claim 17 includes limitation of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 19, claim 19 includes limitation of claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20-23, 25, 26, 28-36, and 38, for a computer system performing the method of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 39-42, 44, 45, 47-55, and 57, for a computer program performing the method of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-17, and 19, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

5. **Claims 5, 18, 24, 37, 43, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wodarz et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,999,912 (issued 12/ 1999) in view of Cuomo et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,185,614 B1 (issued 02/2001), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leighton et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,108,703 (issued 08/2000).**

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 1 as explained above. Wodarz and Cuomo do not disclose the step of wherein the unique identifier associated with the content object is generated by a hashing function. Leighton discloses the step of URL associated with the content object is generated by a hashing function (col.4, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz, Cuomo and Leighton to provide a highly unique identifier for the content object, since the hash function was well known for providing a unique identifier of a piece of data.

Regarding dependent claim 18, claim 18 includes limitation of claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 24 and 37, for a computer system performing the method of claim 5, are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 43 and 56, for a computer program performing the method of claim 5, are rejected under the same rationale.

6. **Claims 8, 27, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wodarz et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,999,912 (issued 12/ 1999), Cuomo et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,185,614 B1 (issued 02/2001) in view of Leighton et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,108,703 (issued 08/2000) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Peercy et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,960,429 (issued 09/1999).**

Regarding dependent claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Wodarz and Cuomo teach the limitation of claim 7 as explained above. Wodarz and Cuomo do not disclose the method according to claim 7 further comprising the step of determining a length of time the user views the generated web page using the time stamp within the store record. However, Peercy discloses the step of determining a length of time the user views the generated web page using the time stamp within the store record (col.4, lines56-60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wodarz, Cuomo, and Peercy to help the server determines popular web page to provide to a user, since the sever knew the length of time that the web page was visited, it would have helped the user determine which generated web page is more interesting to the users.

Claim 27, for a computer system performing the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 46 for a computer program performing the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Guenthner et al. (U.S. Pat No.6,230,196 B1, 05/08/2001) teaches generation of smart HTML anchors in dynamic web page creation.

Donohue et al. (U.S. Pat No.5,987,480, 11/16/1999) teaches method and system for delivering documents customized for a particular user the internet using imbedded dynamic content.

Fields et al. (U.S. Pat No.6,128,655, 10/03/2000) teaches distribution mechanism for filtering formatting and reuse of web based context.

Merriman et al. (U.S. Pat No.5,948,061, 09/07/1999) teaches method of delivery, targeting, and measuring advertising over networks.

Angles et al. (U.S. Pat No.5,933,811, 08/03/1999) teaches system and method for delivering customized advertisement within interactive communication system.

Myerson (U.S. Pat No.5,892,917, 04/06/1999) teaches system for log record and log expansion with inserted log records representing object request for specified object corresponding to cached object copies.

Art Unit: 2176

Papierniak et al. (U.S. Pat No.6,169,997, 01/02/2001) teaches method and apparatus for forming subject (context) map and presenting internet data according to the subject map.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu v Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except the second Friday of each biweek.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Herndon R Heather can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-5403 for regular communications and (703) 308-5403 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Thu v Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2176

TVH
August 13, 2001


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER